

menas in view of Shaginian et al. in order to perform standard operations with a derrick such as installing pipes or sucker rods in a well by gripping a pipe segment and applying torque to screw together an additional length of pipe.

The Applicant, however, respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position for the following reasons:

- 1) Providing the Geppert crane with elements disclosed in Shaginian still fails to provide several elements claimed by the Applicant. For example, Applicant's claimed engine and multiple transmissions do not appear to be disclosed by Geppert and Shaginian. The Applicant's specifically claimed engine and multiple transmissions are a significant part of what makes the Applicant's invention a coherent, self-contained, mobile repair unit, as opposed to just an assortment of components cobbled together. The integration of components, as claimed by the Applicant, applies a common engine to power several diverse machines having very dissimilar operating modes: transportation, lifting, hydraulics, and pneumatics.
- 2) A combination of Geppert and Shaginian fails to disclose a modem. Neither reference even mentions the word. The Examiner refers to circuit 104 of Geppert as a modem. However, circuits 104 appear to simply link various transducers of the crane with the crane's operator panel. For the Geppert crane, circuit 104, transducers 56 and the operator console are apparently all at the same job site. The Applicant's modem, as recited in Claim 1, establishes a telephone-related communication link between a remote home base and various job sites at which the mobile repair unit may be operating.
- 3) The Examiner states that it is well known to operate tongs and slips either hydraulically or pneumatically. But rather than one or the other, the Applicant specifically claims one engine to provide both: hydraulics and pneumatics. This is another example of the Applicant claiming an integrated, coherent mobile repair unit, as opposed to a stand-alone hydraulic drive for the tong, and another stand-alone pneumatic drive for the slip.
- 4) A clock generator 84 of Geppert appears to simply provide timing signals, as commonly found in many digital and microprocessor circuits. The Applicant's clock, on the other hand, provides a time reference, or more specifically a "time of day reference," as amended. The Applicant cannot find where Geppert or Shaginian disclose such a clock.
- 5) The Examiner's proposal of providing the tong and slip of Geppert with elements disclosed in Shaginian fails to point out where the cited art suggests such a modification.

**Response to Examiner's Item 10:**

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geppert in view of Shaginian et al. as applied to Claim 1 and further in view of Heffernan et al. The Examiner states that Heffernan teaches a tachometer 94 with a feedback signal to a control system 21 with memory for the purpose of controlling the velocity of a traveling block. However, the Applicant has amended the claims to recite a tachometer providing a signal, and associating the signal with a time of day reference.

**Response to Examiner's Item 11:**

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geppert in view of Shaginian as applied to Claim 1 and further in view of Selman. The Examiner states that would have been obvious to provide the apparatus of Geppert as modified by Shaginian with a gas detector in view of Heffernan in order to provide a signal to the memory representative of gas concentration. The Applicant, however, submits that such a combination of references is not suggested by the cited art. Also, there are several claimed elements of the Applicant's invention that are not disclosed in the cited art, as already pointed out above.

**Response to Examiner's Item 12:**

Claim 3 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, the Applicant submits that Claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art for reasons already explained above.

**Conclusion:**

The Applicant submits that his invention as claimed is neither anticipated nor obvious in view of the cited art for the reasons given above. Thus the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendments, and in consideration of the Applicant's remarks, to allow the application including Claims 1 – 6.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert J. Harter (Reg: 32,031)  
Patent Agent for Applicant  
608-788-2778  
608-788-9656 (fax)